

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of January 5, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 18 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 23 remain in this application. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18 and 22 to be in a more preferred form and thus, respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0143961 A1 to Siegel et al. (“Siegel”) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,434,700 B1 to Alonso et al. (“Alonso”) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,085,197 to Federighi et al. (“Federighi”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

a first plurality of databases and interfaces for managing and centrally controlling access, from any of said remote entities to said first plurality of databases and to a second plurality of databases, wherein a first database of one of the first and second plurality of databases includes a first profile for a user and a second database of one of the first and second plurality of databases includes a second profile for the user, the first profile corresponding to a first service and the second profile corresponding to a second service different from the first service, and wherein said interfaces comprise:

a plurality of adapters configured to allow access to the first and second plurality of databases, wherein a first adapter of the plurality of adapters is customized to manage a first database typology and a second adapter, different from the first adapter, is customized to manage a second database typology different from the first database typology, the first database typology corresponding to the first database and the second database typology corresponding to the second database.

None of the cited documents, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such features. For example, Siegel generally describes a system whereby user profiles are stored and accessible

by multiple service providers through a central repository. Abstract; *see also* P. 1, para. [0004]. However, in contrast to the recited features of claim 1, Siegel further states that the system only stores a **single** user profile per user, thereby only requiring that changes be made at a single location to ensure that a user profile is kept current. P. 1, para. [0004]. Claim 1 has been amended to provide for multiple user profiles for a user, each of the profiles corresponding to a different service. None of the secondary documents cures these deficiencies of Siegel. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Additionally, even assuming, without conceding, that one of the secondary documents describes multiple user profiles for a user, there would have been no reason to combine such a feature with the disclosure of Siegel since doing so would run counter to Siegel's intended purpose. That is, Siegel clearly describes a preference for single user profile configurations and indicates that one purpose of the system is to allow changes to be made at a single location. P. 1, para. [0004]. In fact, Siegel teaches against separately storing data about each user for each service provider. *See* P. 1, paras. [0002] and [0004]. Thus, it would be nonsensical to have combined a feature that Siegel advocates against with the system of Siegel. Accordingly, claim 1 is also allowable for these reasons.

Claims 18 and 22 have been amended to recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. As such, claims 18 and 22 are patentably distinct from the asserted combination of Siegel, Alonso and Cosic for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-11, 23 and 24 and claims 19-20 ultimately depend on claims 1 and 18, respectively. Therefore, dependent claims 2-11, 19-20, 23 and 24 are patentably distinct from a combination of Siegel, Alonso and Federighi for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 18 in addition to the advantageous features recited therein. For example, claim 6 recites, *inter alia*,

wherein each of the interfaces allows access to one of the plurality of first and second databases via one of a trusted application interface and an untrusted application interface, wherein the trusted application interface is used when access is requested by an authorized application, and wherein the untrusted application interface is used when access is requested by an unknown application.

The Office Action asserts at p. 8 that Siegel describes such features by describing UI logic facilitating interactions between different types of users with the PMT server. (citing p. 2, para. [0026] of Siegel). Applicants respectfully disagree. While the cited portion of Siegel describes

that PMT server 10 may provide a web page that allows a verified and authenticated user to review and modify the user's user profile and associated permissions, there is no teaching or suggestion of an untrusted application interface and the use thereof when an access is requested by an unknown application. Indeed, Siegel fails to teach or suggest determining whether an application is known or unknown, much less treating requests made by such applications differently. None of the cited secondary documents cures this deficiency. Accordingly, notwithstanding the propriety of the asserted combination, claim 6 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Siegel, Alonso and Federighi, and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2001/0016880 A1 to Cai et al. ("Cai"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 12-16 ultimately depend on claim 1. With respect to claim 1, Cai fails to cure the deficiencies of Siegel, Alonso and Federighi. As such, even assuming but not conceding that a combination of Siegel, Alonso, Federighi and Cai would have been appropriate, such a combination would not have resulted in each and every feature of claims 12-16. Accordingly, claims 12-16 are patentably distinct from the asserted combination of Siegel, Alonso, Federighi and Cai. Claim 17 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Appln. No.: 10/533677
Amendment dated April 1, 2010
Reply to Office Action of January 5, 2010

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: April 1, 2010

By: /Chunhsu Andy Mu/
Chunhsu Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001